UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,744	03/13/2006	**Bandi Parthasaradhi Reddy**	H1089/20032	9862

3000 7590 11/12/2008

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.
11TH FLOOR, SEVEN PENN CENTER
1635 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2212

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, TAMTHOM NGO	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1624	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/12/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@crbcp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/571,744	PARTHASARADHI REDDY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAMTHOM N. TRUONG	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *3-13-06*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-61* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-61* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/22/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's preliminary amendment of 3-13-06 has been entered. Claims 1-61 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 16, 34-46 and 51-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

a. Claim 16 recites the term "***anti-solvent***" which has indefinite metes and bounds because there is no definition for said term in the specification. It is unclear if this is another reagent, or a device, or a process.

b. Claim 34 and claims dependent thereon recite the limitation of "***activated tetrahydro-2-furoic acid***" which is not clear how it differs from the usual *tetrahydro-2-furoic acid*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-8, 12-19, 21, 23, 34-36, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Manoury** (4,315,007 – cited on IDS). The alfuzosin base is described in Example II at the step of adding chloroform and sodium hydroxide, then dried over magnesium sulfate and evaporated under vaccumn (see column 3, lines 67-68 and column 4, lines 1-2).

The crystallization in alcoholic (e.g., isoamyl acohol) and/or ketonic solvent (e.g., acetone) can be found in Example I, column 3, lines 10-21, which states:

> A suspension of 3.7 g (0.02 mol) of the above amine and 4.8 g (0.02 mol) of 4-amino-2-chloro-6,7-dimethoxyquinazoline in 35 ml of isoamyl alcohol is then heated to the reflux temperature. The mixture is kept at the boil for 7 hours and left to stand overnight and the precipitate is then filtered off and washed with ethyl acetate and then with ether.
>
> The motor liquors from filtration are evaporated to dryness and the residue obtained is triturated with acetone. This yields a precipitate which is combined with the first and the whole is cyrstallised from a mixture of ethanol and ether. N_1-(4-Amino-6,7-dimethoxyquinazol-2-yl)-N_1-methyl-N_2-(tetrahydrofuroyl-2)-propylenediamine hydrochloride, which melts at 235° C. (decomposition), is thus obtained.

The process recited in claims 34-36 can also be found in Example II in which the *N_1-(4-amino-6,7-dimethoxyquinazol-2-yl)-N_1-methylpropylenediamine* reacts with *tetrahydrofuroic*

acid to yield alfuzosin base which gets converted to HCl salt in alcoholic solvent (i.e., 2-propanol).

The process recited in claims 23, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46, 48-50 -- converting the HCl salt of alfuzosin to alfusozin base-- can be found in Example II at the step of adding 2-N sodium hydroxide to the residue.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9-11, 20, 22, 24-33, 37, 38, 40, 42, 44 and 51-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Manoury**. Said claims recite a process of crystallizing alfuzosin by using specific solvents such as: *methyl-isobutyl ketone, methanol, ethanol* which are not disclosed in Example I or II of Manoury. However, said solvents are within the same family as acetone, and isoamyl alcohol or 2-propanol.

Thus, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to develop the claimed process because it would have been within the level of the skilled chemist in this art to substitute

one ketone or alcohol for another in the same family of alcohols for optimum yield. See the following MPEP excerpt:

> **Optimization Within Prior Art Conditions or Through Routine Experimentation** Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." **In re Aller**, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40°C and 80°C and an acid concentration between 25% and 70% was held to be prima facie obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100°C and an acid concentration of 10%.); see also **Peterson**, 315 F.3d at 1330, 65 USPQ2d at 1382 ("The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages."); **In re Hoeschele**, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969) (Claimed elastomeric polyurethanes which fell within the broad scope of the references were held to be unpatentable thereover because, among other reasons, there was no evidence of the criticality of the claimed ranges of molecular weight or molar proportions.). For more recent cases applying this principle, see **Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc.**, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989); **In re Kulling**, 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990); and **In re Geisler**, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAMTHOM N. TRUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-0676. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T and Th (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tamthom N. Truong/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624

Tamthom N. Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 1624

***
10-30-08